

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/729,339	12/04/2003	Donald W. Taylor	DE010DT-1	1133	
75	590 05/08/2006		EXAMINER		
MICHAEL K. BOYER			MULCAHY, PETER D		
<b>4110 411</b>	IANAGEMENT CO		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
2000 US HWY MOBERLY, M			1713		
,			DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·			$\sim$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,339	TAYLOR ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter D. Mulcahy	1713	
The MAILING DATE of this communication  Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	S
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F	REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	ONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DA	AYS
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICER 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a control on.  period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON or statute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this commun BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	21 February 2006.	·	
, ,	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for a	llowance except for formal matt	ters, prosecution as to the mer	rits is
closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.E	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,7-18 and 20-33</u> is/are pending	in the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,7-18 and 20-33</u> is/are rejected	<b>l.</b>		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	, aminer	•	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection	•		•
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the			121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·	
•	recien priority under 25 II C.C. I	S 110(a) (d) ar (f)	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	3 119(a)-(u) or (i).	•
1. Certified copies of the priority docu	iments have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority docu		Application No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the			je
application from the International E	•	•	
* See the attached detailed Office action for		received.	,
Attachment(s)	<b></b> .		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9)	· <del></del>	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ Paper No(s)/Mail Date	,	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	)

Art Unit: 1713

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 2, 7-18 and 20-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauterbach US 4,614,674 or JP-11116889.
- 4. The rejection set forth under 35 USC 103 in the paper mailed 12/30/05 is deemed proper and is herein repeated.
- 5. The newly amended claims and the remarks filed in support hterof have been fully considered but have been found not persuasive.
- 6. Applicants argue that the prior art does not teach removing conventional curing agents and replaceing the conventional curing agents with the claimed acrylate curing agents. This is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1713

# Response to Arguments

7. In response to applicant's argument that the art fails to recognize the use of the acrylates as curing agents, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

- 8. In response to applicant's argument that the art fails to recognize the use of the acrylates as curing agents, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.
- 9. The use of the acrylate as an adsorbent in JP-'889 is not germane to the patentability of the claimed invention. The art renders obvious the claimed composition.
- 10. With respect to the USPN '674, one need not equate the claimed acrylate with the flattening agent as argued. The fact that the acrylate compound is used in the system is sufficient to render the claimed composition obvious.

## Double Patenting

This rejection is withdrawn in view of the disclaimers filed.

Art Unit: 1713

## Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the Search Report is not considered to be an information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) requires a legible copy of: (1) each foreign patent; (2) each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; (3) for each cited pending U.S. application, the application specification including claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion, unless the cited pending U.S. application is stored in the Image File Wrapper (IFW) system; and (4) all other information, or that portion which caused it to be listed. In addition, each IDS must include a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office (see 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and (b)), and MPEP § 609.04(a), subsection I. states, "the list ... must be submitted on a separate paper." Therefore, the references cited in the Search Report have not been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of submission of any item of information or any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the IDS, including all "statement" requirements of 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

There was no copy of the cited JP 62 172974 filed.

#### Conclusion :

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1713

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter D. Mulcahy whose telephone number is 571-272-1107. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 571-272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter D. Mulcahy Primary Examiner Art Unit 1713

4/30/06